

REMARKS

Claims 7-12 are pending in the application. Claim 8 has been amended. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 8 and 13 under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112 as indefinite. This rejection is moot as to claim 8, which has been amended, and as to claim 13, which was canceled without prejudice or disclaimer by the Amendment of December 26, 2001.

The Office Action rejects claims 7-13 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Japanese Patent Nos. JP 58-211701 or JP 58-167448 or JP58-213653, hereafter 701 patent, 448 patent and 653 patent, respectively. This rejection is moot as to claim 13, which have been canceled. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's statement that the phrase "...for a high pressure gas discharge luminous body..." is merely an intended use limitation, which can be given very little patentable weight. This is a play on semantics. Nevertheless, to advance prosecution, claim 8 has been amended to recite that the "...reflector is of said high pressure gas discharge luminous body..."

Each of the 701, 448 and 653 patents discloses a glass that is prepared to have a low reflectance. The glass is capable of keeping the low reflectance property for a long period of time without lowering the see-through and transparency. For example, see the 448 patent, English abstract. That is, the glass of these patents has a very high transparency of light. To the contrary, claim 7 recites a reflector that has a light reflective body and not a light transparent body. Accordingly, it is submitted that the rejection under 102(b) is improper and should be withdrawn, because each of the 701, 448 and 653 patents fails to disclose a light reflective body recited by claim 7.


Attached hereto is a marked-up version of the changes made to the specification and claims by the present amendment. The attachment is captioned "Version With Markings To Show Changes Made."

It is respectfully requested for the reasons set forth above that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112 and 35 U.S.C. 102 be withdrawn, that claims 7-12 be allowed and that this application be passed to issue.

For the reasons set forth above, it is submitted that this amendment places the application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and passed to issue. If this amendment is deemed to not place the application in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that it be entered for the purpose of appeal.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 7, 2002

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Charles N.J. Ruggiero", written over a horizontal line.

Charles N.J. Ruggiero
Reg. No. 28,468
Attorney for Applicants
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P.
One Landmark Square, 10th Floor
Stamford, CT 06901-2682
(203) 327-4500

VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE

Application, Serial No. 09/729,675

IN THE CLAIMS

Please amend claim 8 as follows:

8. (Amended) The reflector as claimed in claim 7, wherein said reflector is of said high pressure gas discharge luminous body [coating consists of a fluoropolymer].